REMARKS

Claims 1-21 were examined. All claims were rejected. In response to the above-identified Office Action, Applicants amend claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 12, 15 and 16 to correct minor errors detected during the preparation of this Response, and cancel claims 18-21. No new claims are added. Reconsideration of the rejected claims in light of the amendments and the following remarks is requested.

I. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,687,746 issued to Shuster *et al.* ("*Shuster*") in view of U.S Patent No. 6,081,900 issued to Subramaniam *et al.* ("*Subramaniam*"). Applicants thank the Examiner for locating and carefully analyzing *Shuster*. However, they disagree that the teachings from the references of record would appear to have suggested the claimed subject matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art. Neither reference mentions, even generally, the circumstance that gives rise to a problem addressed by Applicants' invention, and specific claim limitations related to that circumstance are not present in the references.

Claim 1 recites a system comprising a number of elements, including software code to perform certain actions in response to a request received from a requesting frame to load a data object for a target frame that is different from the requesting frame. *Shuster* does discuss framesets, multiple frames, and loading documents from different URLs into the frames (*see, e.g.,* c. 9, ll. 11-20). However, the loading of these frames is triggered by the client's receipt of a frameset document (*see* c. 9, ll. 8-11). This is different from the claimed request received from a requesting frame to load a data object for a target frame that is different from the requesting frame. The problem of frame ownership conflict simply does not arise when multiple frames are loaded in

response to a frameset – it arises when a link in a first frame triggers a request to load data in a second frame. The secondary reference, *Subramaniam*, is relied upon only for its teaching of returning a redirection from the server to the client "to promote use of a secure connection" by replacing "http://" in a URL with "https://". Even assuming (solely for the sake of argument) that *Subramaniam*'s redirect messages teach or suggest the elements of claim 1 of generating a new URL and returning a redirect message with the new URL, the references fail to place at least the foregoing knowledge about frame-to-frame conflict in the public domain. The circumstances under which the redirection should be performed are not identified in either reference, so a practitioner is left without guidance as to when (and, more importantly, *why*) *Subramaniam*'s redirection should be performed by *Shuster*'s server. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the references of record are inadequate to support the rejection of claim 1, and request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

As to claims 2-7, those claims depend directly or indirectly upon claims 1 and are patentable for at least the reasons discussed in support of that base claim. Applicants request that these rejections be withdrawn as well.

Claim 8 recites a method comprising several operations, including two operations to be performed if <u>a request is received from a requesting frame to load a data object for a target frame</u> and <u>an owner of the requesting frame is different from an owner providing the data object</u>. The two antecedents or protases (underlined) in the conditional are not specifically addressed in the Examiner's analysis; instead, the observation is made that "a request can be received from a requesting frame to load a data object for a target frame with a different owner." However, that is not what *Shuster* teaches. Instead, the reference explains that a *frameset* can cause the user computer to load documents from different URLs into different frames. The request is not received from a requesting frame, nor is any comparison of ownership performed (because none is necessary). Again, even assuming that *Subramaniam* can be applied as

the Examiner suggests, the references fail to teach or suggest performing any method that includes the conditional determination required by claim 8. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Claims 9-14 depend directly or indirectly on claim 8, and are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above. The Examiner should withdraw the rejections of those claims also.

Claim 15 recites a machine-readable medium containing instructions to cause a processor to perform certain operations. Among those are: receiving a request from a requesting frame of a client browser to load a data object for a target frame; and determining if an owner of the target frame is different from an owner providing the data object. These operations are similar to those discussed above, and shown to be missing from the references of record. For essentially the same reasons, Applicants ask that the rejection of claim 15 be withdrawn.

Claims 16 and 17 depend on claim 15, and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as their base claim.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending, namely claims 1-17, patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record, and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would be useful in moving the application forward to allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (310) 207-3800.

Dated: December 7, 2005

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Thomas M. Coester, Reg. No. 39,637

12400 Wilshire Boulevard	CERTIFICATE OF MAILING
Seventh Floor	
Los Angeles, California 90025	I hereby certify that the correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope with sufficient postage, addressed to:
(310) 207-3800	
	Mail Stop Amendment
	Commissioner for Patents
	P.O. Box 1450
	Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
	Marilyn Bass 12-07-05
	Date